

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 17, 2005

LB 312

investment and save two or three jobs doing it, I can understand. That's a business decision. But I hate to penalize them with refunding unused credits, or taking a reduction in credits. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Baker. Senator Landis, on the Redfield amendment.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I'm going to carry this bill. If this amendment gets adopted, I'll be proud to carry this bill in whatever form that the Legislature tells me to do it in. Economic development is more, or different, than just a jobs program, although jobs seems to be the sine qua non of our economic development posture. Keeping a company with the latest technology is also valuable. The promise that a company makes under this tier is, we promise to spend money. That's about it. It's the one, I've got to say, that probably the committee had the least sentiment for, but it ultimately came around to the idea of an investment-only option, because companies grow stronger and better and deeper in their commitment to the state if they are twenty-first century technology. And if that means robots, then that's...then it means robots. Is it our desire to make sure that they have older technology forms, or outdated forms, or inefficient forms? Is that what we're going to require? I don't think so. What we want them to do is to be as strong, as economically viable, as profitable as they can be. Why? Because good, strong companies that are twenty-first century companies with the latest technology will be here the longest, they'll be here the deepest, they will share in the community, they will shape where we go as an economy, as opposed to simply rewarding those who have older technologies, but labor intensive. So, while I...I've got to say, it is an anomaly. I think Senator Redfield and Senator Raikes points out there's something very strange. Why would we incent somebody who, after they did their upgrade, had fewer jobs than they had before? Because that's possible. The answer is that if you keep people in an inefficient quality, they are imperiled in their ability to survive. You want your companies in the most economic form they can be, the most profitable form that they can be. And the reason is they will be able to be here longer, deeper, and stronger if they are